REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed on March 4, 2009.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed March 4, 2009, claims 1, 2, 6-10 ,16 ,17 ,19, 21-31, and 33 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claim 17 was rejected under **35 USC § 112** as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 9 and 16 were rejected under **MPEP 2129** as being anticipated by applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA).

Claims 1 and 30 wee rejected under **35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Tso et al. (Tso), U.S. Publication No. 2001/0054089 Al, in view of Bates et al. (Bates), U.S. Patent No. 6,947,924 B2.

Claims 2, 6-7, and 21 were rejected under **35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Tso and Bates as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Berstis, U.S. Patent No. 6,182,122 Bl.

Claims 10, 17, 19, 23, 25-27, and 33 were rejected under **35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over AAPA, Tso, Bates, and Berstis.

Claims 22, 24, 29, and 31 were rejected under **35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over AAPA, Tso, and Bates.

Claim 28 was rejected under **35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over AAPA, Tso, Bates, Berstis, and Martin.

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Response amends claims 1, 9-10, 16-17, 22, and 30-31; leaving for the Examiner's consideration claims 1-2, 6-10, 16-17, 19, 21-31, and 33. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any original presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

III. Rejections under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

In the Office Action mailed March 4, 2009, Claim 17 was rejected because the phrase "the queue of hyperlinks" lacks antecedent basis. The present response hereby amends Claim 17 to depend on claim 10 as opposed to claim 9 and additionally amends the phrase "the queue of hyperlinks" to instead read "the rank-ordered queue of hyperlinks" to be fully consistent with claim 10 .

IV. Claim Rejections under MPEP 2129

Clam 9

In the Office Action mailed March 4, 2009, the rejection of Claim 9 states:

> AAPA discloses a method of displaying webpages in a web browser operating on a user's computer (Pg. 3, ln. 23 — Pg. 4, ln. 12), including:
>
> > displaying a plurality of fully functional webpages in a single web browser at the same time such that all of said plurality of fully functional webpages are simultaneously visible to the user (Pg. 3, ln. 23 — Pg. 4, ln. 12).

The Office Action further states that:

> "Applicant makes multiple statements that call into question the novelty of the claimed invention in the aforementioned section of the specification. For example, "It is possible to subjugate multiple websites and their respective webpages within a website's webpage(s)." Applicant then further states, "Even though a website may subjugate another related website's webpages through mechanisms such as Frames discussed in the foregoing, web browsers do not generally [emphasis added] display and operate on multiple independent websites at one time." The use of the word "generally" implies that there are some instances in which web browsers do "display and operate on multiple independent websites at one time."

To clarify Applicant's statements above, in saying "It is possible to subjugate multiple websites and their respective webpages within a website's webpage(s)", Applicant was

thinking ahead to Applicant's invention and misspoke by placing this statement in the background section of the specification. At the time of Applicant's invention, Applicant was only aware of a website subjugating a single webpage - not subjugating multiple webpages and displaying them simultaneously or allowing simultaneous operation on multiple subjugated webpages. Subjugating a single (daughter) webpage on a (parent) webpage, as existed in the art at that time, is very different than applicant's invention because it does not allow simultaneous operation and in some cases simultaneous viewing of both the parent and daughter webpages. For instance, if after performing an operation in the daughter webpage, a user then clicks on a link in the parent webpage that causes the browser to go to a different webpage on the parent website, the state of operation within the daughter webpage will be lost. Subsequently, the next time the user goes to the parent webpage that exposes this same daughter webpage for viewing, the daughter webpage will be reset to an initial condition having lost any navigation or operations previously performed on that daughter webpage. Thus, simultaneous operation of both the parent and daughter webpages was not possible on websites that offered such functionality at the time of applicant's original filing.

Note the following excerpt from page 4, lines 5-12 of Applicant's specification as filed wherein applicant clearly states that applicant was not aware of the existence of such capabilities at the time of filing:

> "Web browsers and search engines, do not coalesce pertinent webpages, as opposed to hyperlinks, and simultaneously display multiple webpages. This inability greatly impedes information search, retrieval, and viewing processes given current levels of processor power and Internet connection bandwidth. To display and/or operate on more than one webpage at a time and have the search capabilities that users have become accustomed to would require enhancements to the web browser and tight integration of the web browser and search engine control functions—something that has not been done to date."

Had Applicant been aware of the capability to display and operate on multiple webpages within a single browser instance, Applicant would not have been able to make the above statement.

Applicant had, however, realized that the possibility existed to use the inline frames structure of Internet Explorer and augment Internet Explorer with additional software to implement multiple subjugated webpages although this had never been performed to Applicant's knowledge. In the time frame preceding the filing of Applicant's Provisional Application for the present invention, Applicant reduced to practice the subject invention by implementing software modifications to Internet Explorer using the aforementioned inline frames structure.

The Office Action further states:

> "Furthermore, Applicant merely claims that multiple webpages may be displayed and operated on simultaneously by a "single web browser". A single web browser (such as Internet Explorer®, Firefox®, etc.) is a different concept than a single instance of a web browser (such as one instance of Firefox® running a user's computer). In other words, the claim would be anticipated by a user running two instances of a single web browser in two separate visible windows on his or her computer, each displaying, and allowing operation of, a fully functional webpage (i.e., when a user shrinks the size of an instance of a browser in order to be able to view a second instance of a browser on the user's screen at once)."

On this subject, Applicant respectfully disagrees. A computer "running two instances of a single web browser in two separate visible windows" would not be operable to achieve the same functionality as that claimed by applicant. The functionality described in Applicant's claim 9 covers the function where multiple related webpages may be viewed and operated on simultaneously, as well as being bookmarked, printed and dropped to an icon with a single computer mouse click. A user "running two instances of a single web browser in two separate visible windows" accomplishes none of these things and also requires the user to choose the webpages independently - in other words, the user must

manually make the relationship association between the multiple webpages displayed, while in Applicant's claim 9, a single instance of a web browser may choose the subjugated webpages to be displayed according to some relationship (for example, search results from a common web search or that the subjugated webpages relate to a common topic (for example cars or cooking). Please also note per the remarks in Applicant's prior Amendment A, that a tabbed browser also does not accomplish the desired functionality of Claim 9 since for the tabbed paradigm, the tabbed windows within a single browser instance are never visible simultaneously.

To make these factors more concise in claim 9, Applicant has hereby amended claim 9 to include that the multiple webpages displayed are "related". Furthermore, to be clear that there are multiple webpages displayed in the single web browser instance, applicant has added that the web browser is a "single web browser instance". In addition, to be clear that there are at least two subjugated webpages in the "single web browser instance", Applicant has added that there must be displayed "at least two additional fully functional and related" webpages. Applicant has also amended claim 9 to clarify that said at least two additional fully functional webpages "may be operated on simultaneously" (page 12, lines 16-19 in Applicant's specification as filed).

Thus as amended, Claim 9 defines:

> *9. A method of displaying webpages in a single web browser instance operating on a user's computer, including:*
> *displaying at least two additional fully functional and related webpages in a single web browser instance at the same time such that all of said at least two additional fully functional webpages are simultaneously visible to the user and may be operated on simultaneously, and where any of said at least two additional webpages may be operated on without altering the state of another of said at least two additional webpages.*

Claim 10

Dependent claim 10 has been amended to clarify that "a search engine" is "an Internet search engine".

Claim 16

In the Office Action mailed March 4, 2009, the rejection of Claim 16 states:

> "AAPA discloses changing the number of webpages that are simultaneously displayed according to an input from the user (AAPA: the scenarios, discussed above in reference to claim 9, of re-sizing multiple windows to display on a single user's screen inherently include the capability of the user to open or close additional instances of the web browser as desired)."

Note that applicant has amended claim 16, to depend on claim 10 as opposed to claim 9. Applicant has also amended claim 16 to include that when opening additional webpages for simultaneous viewing and operation, these additional webpages are automatically populated with webpages corresponding to hyperlinks in said rank-ordered queue of hyperlinks (pg. 22, li. 20— pg. 23, li. 13). Thus as amended, claim 16 now states:

> *16. The method of claim 10 including changing the number of webpages that are simultaneously displayed according to an input from the user and when additional webpages are made visible, populating these additional webpages automatically with webpages corresponding to hyperlinks in said rank-ordered queue of hyperlinks.*

V. Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)

In the Office Action mailed March 4, 2009, 11. Claims 1 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tso et al. (Tso), U.S. Publication No. 2001/0054089 Al, in view of Bates et al. (Bates), U.S. Patent No. 6,947,924 B2.

On page 7 of the subject office action, the examiner summarizes by stating that "the guided tour of Tso (which at least discloses the claim limitations minus the search engine)...". Applicant respectfully disagrees, and would like to point out that the combination of Tso with a conventional search engine or with the teachings of Bates (US Pat No 6,947,924) would not be operable. A conventional search engine operates automatically to locate relevant webpages and rank-order their priority. The guided tour of Tso works in the opposite way - the webpages being manually ordered in advance by the builder of the guided tour.

In paragraph [0004] in Tso he states:

> "...information about the web pages in the guided tour is to the viewer in the order specified by the guided tour builder. The viewer is then able to view the web pages in the display order selected by the guided tour builder." In paragraph [0005] in Tso he states: "A guided tour order is received from the guided tour builder." In paragraph [0035] in Tso he states: "The web page is also assigned a sequential number so that the web pages are displayed in the order that they were recorded."

It is therefore clear that the ordering of the webpages for Tso's invention is set (manually) by the builder of the guided tour. This is not uncommon for guided tours in general where there is usually a script of some kind created by the builder of the tour. Thus, it is inappropriate to apply the teachings of Tso in rejecting any claims for Applicant's invention where Applicant specifically requires a hyperlink list that has been automatically rank-ordered by a search engine. Also, for the guided tour of Tso, the builder knows the contents of all webpages in advance. As well known in the art, a conventional search engine produces a list of links to webpages where there is no specific knowledge of what links will be supplied until a request is made to the search engine and it performs its search. In addition, due to the ever changing nature of the information that exists on the Internet, the results produced by an Internet search engine may even change from moment to moment if the same search were to be performed successively.

To make this distinction perfectly clear and in keeping with the common knowledge in the art of how a conventional Internet search engine functions, Applicant has amended claim 1 to read as follows:

> *1. A method for retrieving and viewing webpages in a single web browser instance operating on a user's computer, comprising the sequential steps of:*
>
> *submitting, from said web browser, a search request to an Internet search engine located on the Internet;*
>
> *receiving a hyperlink list from said search engine, said hyperlink list having been automatically rank-ordered by said search engine, to form a queue of rank-ordered hyperlinks;*
>
> *automatically loading a plurality of webpages referred to by said queue of rank-ordered hyperlinks to form a rank-ordered queue of webpages stored on the user's computer; and*
>
> *viewing said webpages in the single web browser instance.*

The office action also stated:

> "Tso discloses a search engine in that the database is enabled to allow "a user to select search criteria and execute searches of a database that resides on a remote computer" ([0022], ln. 8-10) and "searching for information and sending it back to the client, such as when a database on the Web is queried" ([0023], ln. 5-7). Therefore, Tso may be interpreted as allowing the user to search the database for the desired guided tour and thus the guided tour database would be a search engine."

The discussion above as excerpted from Tso was simply Tso's description of how common operations on the Internet happen. He was not describing the specific function of his guided tour. While the Examiner is correct that one might locate Tso's guided tour function as the result of a search, it does not follow that "the guided tour database would be a search engine" as stated by the Examiner. As described in the preceding

paragraphs, Tso's guided tour functions quite differently from a conventional Internet search engine.

Claim 30

Claim 30 was rejected for reasons similar to claim 1 above. Additionally, the Office Action stated that "Bates discloses multiple search engines (Col. 3, ln. 4-6)".

Applicant wishes to point out that Bates does not, in fact, utilize multiple search engines simultaneously, as required by applicant's invention as claimed. The invention as disclosed by Bates (col. 1, lns. 54-60), provides:

> "a search engine system that allows an end user within a group to improve search results for other users within the group. In a first aspect, the invention provides a group-based search engine for locating web pages, comprising: a system for associating a user group with a web search; and a search system for generating a list of search results ordered by a ranking in response to the web search, wherein the ranking is based on at least one nomination previously made by a member of the user group."

Essentially Bates alters the search results based on input from users within a specific group of users. The Examiner also mentioned (Col. 3, ln. 4-6) in Bates which reads as follows:

> "The data is then utilized by the search engine system to refine search results generated by traditional search engines (e.g., Yahoo™, Google™, etc.)."

Here, Bates is simply stating that his invention may be used with any of the popular search engines. He is not stating that his invention is capable of "simultaneously submitting, from said web browser, a search request to multiple search engines located on the Internet", as required by Applicant's claim 30. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 30 as currently amended is allowable in view of this argument, and those arguments given with respect to the rejection of Applicant's claim 1.

In addition, applicant would like to note that Applicant's claim 30 as amended requires that rank-ordered hyperlink lists returned from multiple search engines are then used for:

"forming a single queue of hyperlinks from all hyperlink lists received by aggregating and/or prioritizing hyperlinks from said hyperlink lists;"

Support for this requirement is found in (pg. 10. li. 1-17) of Applicant's specification as filed. None of the cited prior art discloses this capability.

Dependent claim 31 has also been amended to more distinctly claim the invention. Support for modifications to claim 31 is found in (pg. 12, li. 16-19) and (pg. 23, li. 15-27) of Applicant's original specification as filed.

Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA, Tso, and Bates.

Claim 22

The Office Action rejected Claim 22 for reasons similar to claims 1 and 9.
As amended, independent Claim 22 defines:

22. A method for retrieving and viewing webpages in a single web browser instance operating on a user's computer, comprising the sequential steps of:

submitting, from said single web browser, a search request to an Internet search engine located on the Internet;

receiving a hyperlink list from said Internet search engine, said hyperlink list having been automatically rank-ordered by said Internet search engine;

automatically loading a plurality of webpages referred to by said hyperlink list to form a rank-ordered queue of webpages stored on the user's computer; and

viewing at least two webpages from said rank-ordered queue of webpages in separate windows within said single web browser instance such that all of said at least two webpages are fully active and simultaneously visible, and where any

of said at least two webpages may be operated on without altering the state of another of said at least two webpages.

Claim 22 includes embodiments similar to those described in claims 1 and 9, and the arguments traversing the rejections of claims 1 and 9 appropriately support the validity of claim 22. Support for portions of claim 22 as currently amended can also be found in (pg. 12, li. 16-19) and (pg. 23, li. 15-27) of Applicant's original specification as filed.

Claims 2, 6-8, 16-17, 19, 21, 23-29, and 33

Claims 2, 6-8, 16-17, 19, 21, 23-29, and 33 are not addressed separately, but it is respectively submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2, 6-8, 16-17, 19, 21, 23-29, and 33 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

***